

Photo-acoustic tomography in a rotating measurement setting

Guillaume Bal* Amir Moradifam[†]

August 24, 2016

Abstract

Photo-acoustic tomography (PAT) aims to leverage the photo-acoustic coupling between optical absorption of light sources and ultrasound (US) emission to obtain high contrast reconstructions of optical parameters with the high resolution of sonic waves. Quantitative PAT often involves a two-step procedure: first the map of sonic emission is reconstructed from US boundary measurements; and second optical properties of biological tissues are evaluated. We consider here a practical measurement setting in which such a separation does not apply. We assume that the optical source and an array of ultrasonic transducers are mounted on a rotating frame (in two or three dimensions) so that the light source rotates at the same time as the US measurements are acquired. As a consequence, we no longer have the option to reconstruct a map of sonic emission corresponding to a given optical illumination. We propose here a framework where the two steps are combined into one and an absorption map is directly reconstructed from the available ultrasound measurements.

1 Introduction

Photo-acoustic tomography (PAT) is a novel medical imaging modality that aims to image the optical properties of biological tissues with high resolution. It combines the high contrast of optical (mostly absorption) parameters with the high resolution of ultrasound. As radiation propagates into tissues, a small fraction is transformed into sonic waves by the photo-acoustic effect. These sonic waves propagate through the domain and are measured by an array of transducers at the boundary of the domain of interest $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where n is spatial dimension.

Mathematically, sound propagation is modeled by the following scalar wave equation:

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - c^2 \Delta)v = 0 & \text{in } (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \\ v|_{t=0} = H(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \\ \partial_t v|_{t=0} = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

*Department of Applied Physics and Applied Mathematics, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10027, USA. E-mail: gb2030@columbia.edu.

[†]Department of Mathematics, University of California, Riverside, CA, USA. E-mail: moradifam@math.ucr.edu.

Here the function $c(x)$ is assumed to be a smooth function and $H(x)$ is the amount of acoustic signal generated by the absorbed radiation of a short pulse of light propagating throughout the domain. Its expression is given by

$$H(x) = \lambda(x)\sigma(x)u(x), \quad (2)$$

where for each $x \in \Omega$, $u(x)$ is the density of radiation reaching point x , $\sigma(x)$ is the absorption coefficient, and $\lambda(x)$ is the Grüneisen coefficient, which characterizes the amount of ultrasound generated by each absorbed photon.

A reasonable model for the propagation of radiation is given by the following second-order elliptic equation

$$\begin{cases} -\nabla \cdot \gamma(x)\nabla u + \sigma u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = f & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$), $\gamma(x)$ is a (scalar) diffusion coefficient and f describes how light enters the domain Ω .

Photoacoustic Tomography aims to reconstruct $(\gamma(x), \sigma(x))$ as well as possibly $\lambda(x)$ from the measurements $v(t, x)|_{\partial\Omega}$ of the acoustic pressure leaving the domain Ω at each point $x \in \partial\Omega$ and each positive time $t > 0$; as well as for each available probing illumination f .

Such reconstructions are typically done in two steps. In a first step, the sonic source H is reconstructed from the measurements $v(t, x)|_{\partial\Omega}$. This is a well-posed problem, at least in the presence of complete data and when sound speed $c(x)$ is known; see, e.g., [11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20] and their references for experimental and theoretical works on the first, qualitative, step of PAT.

Once $H(x)$ has been reconstructed for one or more illuminations f on $\partial\Omega$, the second, quantitative, step of PAT allows us to obtain explicit reconstructions of γ , σ , and λ in some cases. We refer to [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 22] as well as their references for several works on the problem. Note that high resolution reconstructions can typically not be achieved by purely optical measurements, which are modeled by a problem that has similar stability properties to the standard electrical impedance tomography problem; see [1].

In this paper, we consider an experimental setting [4, 21] in which such a separation into first and second steps is not feasible. The reason is that the source of radiation f and the small array of transducers performing the acoustic measurements are mounted on a rotating frame. In other words, as the pressure $v(t, x)$ is measured by a rotating array of transducers on $\partial\Omega$, it corresponds to a radiation source f that also rotates. We thus no longer acquire a pressure $v(t, x)$ that corresponds to a single illumination f and cannot even define a meaningful initial condition $H(x)$. The objective of this paper is to present a mathematical framework for this experimental setting, whose main advantage is that it allows for a clear spatial separation between the light source and the array of detectors.

As we mentioned above, the qualitative and quantitative steps of PAT need to be merged into one reconstruction. In order to simplify the presentation, we assume that the Grüneisen coefficient is known and set to 1. We also assume that the diffusion coefficient γ is known and is normalized to 1. Under these assumptions, we present a theory for the reconstruction of the absorption coefficient σ from knowledge of pressure measurements at the domain's boundary in the aforementioned rotating setting.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. The measurement setting and our main results are presented in Section 2. The proof of our main result is split into a proof of a linearized version in Section 3 and a proof of the full nonlinear inverse problem in Section 4.

2 Measurement setting and main results

We consider the stable reconstruction of the absorption coefficient $\sigma(x)$ from multiple partial measurements under the assumption $\gamma = \lambda = 1$ inside a ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$). More precisely, let B_ρ be the ball of radius ρ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and assume $\Omega \Subset B_\rho$. Let $\sigma \in W_0^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, and define

$$\Theta := \{R_i \in SO(n), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m\},$$

a finite number of rotations around the origin in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Now fix $0 \leq g \in H^{1/2}(\partial B_\rho) \cap L^\infty(\partial B_\rho)$ and for $R_i \in \Theta$, define $u_i(x)$ to be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_i + \sigma u_i = 0 & \text{in } B_\rho \\ u = g_i & \text{on } \partial B_\rho, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where $g_i(x) = g(R_i x)$, $R_i \in \Theta$. We shall assume that g is not identically zero and non-negative. In practical applications, we may envision g to have a small support on ∂B_ρ , and certainly to be supported away from the location of the ultrasound transducers we now consider.

Let v_i be the solution of the wave equation

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - c^2 \Delta)v = 0 & \text{in } (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^n \\ v|_{t=0} = \sigma u_i \\ \partial_t v|_{t=0} = 0, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $c \geq c_0 > 0$ is the sound speed, and $c - 1$ is assumed to be supported in $\bar{B}_\rho$. In general the time-dependent wave solution at the boundary of the ball B_ρ is given by

$$\Lambda_i^* \sigma := \Lambda(\sigma u_i) := v_i|_{(0,\infty) \times \partial B_\rho}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m. \quad (6)$$

In practical setting that we consider here, we have access to v_i on $[0, T] \times \Gamma$ for some $\Gamma \Subset \partial B_\rho$ and not on the whole domain $(0, \infty) \times \partial B_\rho$. Typically the support of the ultrasound transducers Γ is relatively small and away from the support of the optical source to avoid measurement interferences.

To model this restriction, fix $\Gamma \subset \partial B_\rho$ and define $\Gamma_i = R_i(\Gamma)$ for $R_i \in \Theta$. Here, we are interested to know if the absorption coefficient $\sigma(x)$ can be stably determined from the finite number of rotating partial measurements

$$\chi_i \Lambda_i^* \sigma = \chi_i \Lambda_i u_i \sigma = \chi_i v_i|_{(0,\infty) \times \partial B_\rho}, \quad R_i \in \Theta, \quad (7)$$

where $\chi_i \in C_0^\infty([0, \infty) \times B_\rho)$ are cut-off functions with $\text{supp}(\chi_i) \subset [0, \infty) \times \Gamma_i$. This is a reasonably faithful model for the experimental setups described in [4, 21], to which we refer the reader for additional details.

We now introduce additional hypotheses and notation in order to state our main result; theorem 2.1 below. One of our main theoretical tools is a description of acoustic

wave propagation in the domain B_ρ mostly following the presentation in [15]. As in [15], and for a given h , we define v to be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - c^2 \Delta)v &= 0 \text{ in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n \\ v|_{[0, T] \times \partial B_\rho} &= h, \\ v|_{t=T} &= \varphi, \\ \partial_t v|_{t=T} &= 0, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where φ is the harmonic extension of $h(T, \cdot)$ in B_ρ . We also define

$$Ah := v(0, \cdot) \text{ in } \bar{B}_\rho, \quad (9)$$

the wave solution at time $t = 0$, and set

$$\mathcal{G} := \{(t, y) : y \in \cup_{R_i \in \Theta} \Gamma_i, 0 < t < s(y)\}, \quad (10)$$

where $s(y)$ is a continuous function on $\cup_{R_i \in \Theta} \Gamma_i$ indicating how long measurements need to last at every measurement point. It is known from, e.g., the work in [15] that longer times are necessary for stability purposes than for injectivity purposes.

As in ([15]) and to guarantee injectivity of the measurement operator, we will assume that there exists $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that

$$\forall x \in \Omega, \exists y \in \Gamma_j \text{ with } \text{dist}(x, y) < s(y), \quad (11)$$

where $\text{dist}(x, y)$ denotes the distance with respect to the metric $c^{-2}g$ (g is the Euclidean metric in $\mathbb{R}^n$). This assumption is partially technical: it imposes that the measurements for one of the rotation step j are taken for a sufficiently long duration that the measurement operator (mapping σ to the available measurements) is injective.

To guarantee stability of the reconstruction of σ , we need the following stronger assumption on $s(y)$:

$$\forall (x, \xi) \in WF(\sigma) \cap (\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n), (\tau_\eta(x, \xi), \gamma_{x, \xi}(\tau_\eta(x, \xi))) \in \mathcal{G} \text{ for } \eta = + \text{ or } \eta = -, \quad (12)$$

where $\gamma_\eta(x, \xi)$ are the integral curves of the corresponding Hamilton vector field (see Chapter 6 in [8]) and

$$\tau_\pm(x, \xi) = \max\{t \geq 0 : \gamma_{x, \xi}(\pm t) \in \bar{B}_\rho\}.$$

We refer to [15] for additional details on this assumption, which here simply means that any singularity of σ at position $x \in B_\rho$ and in direction ξ propagates to a singularity in the measurement set $\mathcal{G}$.

Note that since $\bar{\Omega}$ is compact there exists an open set $\mathcal{G}' \subset \mathcal{G}$ such that (12) still holds. Define

$$\Gamma'_i := \Gamma_i \cap \pi_x(\mathcal{G}')$$

where π_x is the projection map. Now fix the cut-off functions $\chi_i \in C_0^\infty([0, \infty) \times B_\rho)$ such that

$$\text{supp}(\chi_i) \subset \Gamma_i \times (0, \infty) \cap \mathcal{G} \text{ and } \chi_i = 1 \text{ on } \Gamma'_i \times (0, \infty) \cap \mathcal{G}.$$

The following is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.1 *Let B_ρ be the ball of radius ρ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\Omega \Subset B_\rho$, and $\sigma \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that (11) and (12) hold. If*

$$\Lambda_i^*(\sigma) = \Lambda_i^*(\tilde{\sigma}) \quad \text{on } \Gamma_i \times (0, \infty) \cap \mathcal{G}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

then $\sigma = \tilde{\sigma}$ in Ω . Moreover, there exist a constant $\eta > 0$ such that for all $\tilde{\sigma} \in W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$ with

$$C_\Omega \|\tilde{\sigma}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} < \eta, \quad (13)$$

where C_Ω is the best constant in the classical Poincaré inequality on $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then the following stability estimate holds

$$\|\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C \sum_{i=1}^m \|\chi_i \Lambda_i^*(\sigma) - \chi_i \Lambda_i^*(\tilde{\sigma})\|_{H^1([0,T] \times \partial B_\rho)}, \quad (14)$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $\tilde{\sigma}$ and σ .

Remark 2.2 *Notice that C_Ω is small for a small region Ω ($\Omega \subset B_r$ for some small r), and therefore the condition (13) is satisfied if the support of σ is small in B_ρ . This is consistent with the experiments in [4] where the method is applied on small animals.*

3 Stability of the Linearized Problem

In this section we study the linearized problem associated with (4)-(7). Fix $\sigma \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $\tilde{\sigma} \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. Assume $u_i, \tilde{u}_i$ be the corresponding solutions of (4). Then

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \delta u_i + \tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i = -u_i \delta \sigma & \text{in } B_\rho \\ \delta u_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_\rho, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\delta u_i = u_i - \tilde{u}_i$ and $\delta \sigma = \sigma - \tilde{\sigma}$. Thus

$$\delta u_i(x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \int \int e^{i(x-y)\xi} q(x, \xi) u_i(y) \delta \sigma(y) dy d\xi,$$

where $q(x, \xi) = \frac{-1}{1+\xi^2} \bmod \in S^{-3}(B_\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n)$, i.e.

$$q(x, \xi) + \frac{1}{1+\xi^2} \in S^{-3}(B_\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Recall that a symbol $P(x, \xi) \in S^m$ if

$$|D_x^\beta D_\xi^\alpha P(x, \xi)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta} (\sqrt{1+|\xi|^2})^{m-|\alpha|},$$

for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^n$. See Chapter 1 in [8] for more details about symbols and oscillatory integrals. Now let $\delta p_i(t, x)$ be the solution of the wave equation

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_t^2 - c^2 \Delta) \delta p_i(t, x) = 0 & \text{in } (0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^n \\ \delta p_i|_{t=0} = \sigma u_i - \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{u}_i \\ \partial_t \delta p_i(t, x)|_{t=0} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Notice that

$$\sigma u_i - \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{u}_i = \Delta(\delta u_i).$$

Hence modulo smooth terms

$$\begin{aligned} \delta p_i(t, x) &:= (2\pi)^{-n} \sum_{\tau=\pm} \int \int e^{i\varphi_\tau(t, x, \xi)} a_\tau(t, x, \xi) [\sigma u_i(y) - \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{u}_i(y)] d\xi dy \\ &= (2\pi)^{-n} \sum_{\tau=\pm} \int \int e^{i\varphi_\tau(t, x, \xi)} a_\tau(t, x, \xi) \Delta(\delta u_i(y)) d\xi dy \end{aligned}$$

where the phase function $\varphi_\pm$ are homogeneous of order 1 and solve the eikonal equations

$$\mp \partial_t \varphi_\pm = |D_x \varphi_\pm|, \quad \varphi_\pm|_{t=0} = x \cdot \xi,$$

$a_\pm$ are amplitudes of order zero satisfying the corresponding transport equations (see equation V.1.50 in [17]). Now define $F_\pm$ to be the Fourier integral operators

$$F_\pm(w) := (2\pi)^{-n} \int \int e^{i\varphi_\pm(t, x, \xi)} a_\pm(t, x, \xi) w(y) d\xi dy,$$

and P_i to be the pseudodifferential operator

$$P_i(w) := (2\pi)^{-n} \int \int e^{i(x-y)\xi} a(x, y, \xi) w(y) dy d\xi,$$

where $a(x, y, \xi) = u_i(y) \bmod S^{-1}(B_\rho \times B_\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. Then

$$\delta p_i(t, x) = F_+ P_i(\delta \sigma) + F_- P_i(\delta \sigma).$$

Eliminate the dependence on y in the symbol $a(x, y, \xi)$ to get

$$P_i(w) := (2\pi)^{-n} \int \int e^{i(x-y)\xi} b(x, \xi) w(y) dy d\xi,$$

where $b(x, \xi) = u_i(x) \bmod S^{-1}(B_\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n)$. The composition of the Fourier integral operator $F_\pm$ with the pseudodifferential operator P_i is a Fourier integral operator with the same phase φ_τ and amplitude $b_\tau(t, x, y, \xi) = u_i(y) a_\tau(t, x, \xi) \bmod S^{-1}(B_\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n)$ (see [17]). Therefore

$$\delta p_i(t, x) = (2\pi)^{-n} \sum_{\tau=\pm} \int \int e^{i\varphi_\tau(t, x, \xi)} b_\tau(t, x, \xi) u_i(y) \delta \sigma dy d\xi, \quad (17)$$

where $b_\tau(t, x, \xi) = a_\tau(t, x, \xi) \bmod S^{-1}(B_\rho \times \mathbb{R}^n)$.

The measurements are modeled by the operator

$$\Lambda^*(\sigma) := \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda_i^*(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \sigma).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^*(\delta \sigma) = \Lambda^*(\sigma) - \Lambda^*(\tilde{\sigma}) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \sigma - \tilde{u}_i \tilde{\sigma}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i + u_i \delta \sigma) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta \sigma). \end{aligned}$$

The above pseudodifferential calculus in (17) indicates that $H_{\delta\sigma} := \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta\sigma)$ is the higher order term in $\Lambda^*(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma})$, and $L_{\delta\sigma} := \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i)$ may be controlled by $H_{\delta\sigma}$ for small $\delta\sigma$ (see Section 4). Hence we first study invertibility of the operator

$$p(\delta\sigma) := \sum_{i=1}^m (2\pi)^{-n} \chi_i \sum_{\tau=\pm} \int \int e^{i\varphi_{\tau}(t,x,\xi)} b_{\tau}(t,x,\xi) u_i(y) \delta\sigma dy d\xi = \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta\sigma) \quad (18)$$

and find an approximate inverse. Let A be the back-propagation operator defined in (9) and set

$$\kappa(\delta\sigma) := A \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta\sigma) \right). \quad (19)$$

Proposition 3.1 *The operator κ is a zero order pseudo-differential operator in a neighborhood of Ω with principal symbol*

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [\chi_i(\gamma_{x,\xi}(\tau_+(x,\xi))) + \chi_i(\gamma_{x,\xi}(\tau_-(x,\xi)))] u_i(x). \quad (20)$$

Consequently if (11) and (12) hold, then κ is an elliptic Fredholm operator on $H_0^1(\Omega)$, and there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\| \delta\sigma \|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta\sigma) \right\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})}. \quad (21)$$

Proof. First note that

$$\kappa(\delta\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^m A(\chi_i \delta p_i(t, x)).$$

It follows from Theorem 3 in [15] that the principle symbol of κ is given by (20). It follows from maximum principle that $u_i \geq \beta > 0$ in $\overline{\Omega}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ satisfies (12),

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n [\chi_i(\gamma_{x,\xi}(\tau_+(x,\xi))) + \chi_i(\gamma_{x,\xi}(\tau_-(x,\xi)))] u_i(x) \geq \frac{\beta}{2} > 0.$$

Thus the operator κ is elliptic, and therefore it follows from the mapping properties of the back-propagation operator A (see [10] and [15]) that

$$\| \delta\sigma \|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C \left(\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta\sigma) \right\|_{H^1(\mathcal{G})} + \| \delta\sigma \|_{L^2(\Omega)} \right).$$

Since (11) holds for some $1 \leq j \leq m$, by Theorem 2 in [15], the measurement $\chi_j \Lambda(\sigma u_j)$ uniquely determines σu_j in Ω . On the other hand, u_j is the unique solution of

$$-\Delta u_j = -\sigma u_j \quad u_j|_{\partial B_\rho} = g_j \geq 0.$$

By strong maximum principle we have $u_j > 0$ in Ω . Hence if (11) holds, then $\sigma = \frac{\sigma u_j}{u_j}$ is uniquely determined from a single measurement $\chi_j \Lambda(\sigma u_j)$. Consequently the operator $\sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta\sigma)$ is also injective. Therefore it follows from Proposition V.3.1 in [18] that the estimate (21) holds for some constant $C > 0$, possibly different from the above constant. $\square$

4 Stability of the Nonlinear Problem

In this section we present the proof of Theorem 2.1. Let B_ρ be the ball of radius ρ in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and assume σ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are essentially bounded in B_ρ and $\Omega := \text{supp}(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma}) \Subset B_\rho$. For fixed $0 \leq g \in H^{1/2}(\partial B)$ and for $R_i \in \Theta$ define $u_i(x)$ to be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_i + \sigma u_i = 0 & \text{in } B_\rho \\ u = g_i & \text{on } \partial B_\rho, \end{cases}$$

where $g_i(x) = g(R_i x)$, $R_i \in \Theta$. Similarly let $\tilde{u}_i$ be the unique solution of

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \tilde{u}_i + \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{u}_i = 0 & \text{in } B_\rho \\ \tilde{u}_i = g_i & \text{on } \partial B_\rho. \end{cases}$$

Then $\delta u_i = u_i - \tilde{u}_i$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \delta u_i + \tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i = -u_i \delta \sigma & \text{in } B_\rho \\ \delta u_i = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_\rho. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Since the mapping $\Lambda : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1([0, T] \times \partial B_\rho)$ is bounded (see Remark 5 in [15]), it is enough to prove the theorem for $\sigma, \tilde{\sigma} \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$. The general result will follow from a standard density argument.

Multiply (22) by δu_i and integrate by parts and use Hölder's inequality to get

$$\| \nabla \delta u_i \|_{L^2(B_\rho)}^2 + \int_{B_\rho} \tilde{\sigma} (\delta u_i)^2 dx \leq \| u_i \delta \sigma \|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \| \delta u_i \|_{L^2(B_\rho)}.$$

By Poincaré inequality, there exists C_Ω such that

$$\| \delta u_i \|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \leq C_\rho \| \nabla \delta u_i \|_{L^2(B_\rho)},$$

where C_ρ is dependent of δu_i . Thus we have

$$\| \nabla \delta u_i \|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \leq C_\rho \| u_i \delta \sigma \|_{L^2(B_\rho)}. \quad (23)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \| \tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i \|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} &\leq \| \tilde{\sigma} \|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \| \nabla \delta u_i \|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \\ &\leq C_\rho \| \tilde{\sigma} \|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \| u_i \delta \sigma \|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \\ &\leq C_\rho C_\Omega \| \tilde{\sigma} \|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \| \nabla (u_i \delta \sigma) \|_{L^2(B_\rho)}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_Ω is the best constant in the classical Poincaré inequality on $H_0^1(\Omega)$. Thus we have

$$\| \tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i \|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C_\rho C_\Omega \| \tilde{\sigma} \|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \| u_i \delta \sigma \|_{H_0^1(\Omega)}. \quad (24)$$

On the other hand, since the mapping $\Lambda : H^1(\Omega) \rightarrow H^1([0, T] \times \partial B_\rho)$ is bounded,

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta \sigma) \right\|_{H^1([0, T] \times \partial B_\rho)} \leq \tilde{C} \| \delta \sigma \|_{H_0^1},$$

for some $\tilde{C} > 0$. Hence it follows from Proposition 3.1 and (24) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\sigma u_i - \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{u}_i) \right\|_{H^1([0,T]) \times \partial B_\rho} &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i) + \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta \sigma) \right\|_{H^1([0,T]) \times \partial B_\rho} \\
&\geq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(u_i \delta \sigma) \right\|_{H^1([0,T]) \times \partial B_\rho} - \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i) \right\|_{H^1([0,T]) \times \partial B_\rho} \\
&\geq C \left\| \delta \sigma \right\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} - \tilde{C} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\sigma} \delta u_i \right\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \\
&\geq C \left\| \delta \sigma \right\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} - \tilde{C} C_\rho C_\Omega \left\| \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \sum_{i=1}^m \left\| u_i \delta \sigma \right\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \\
&\geq \left(C - m M_g \tilde{C} C_\rho C_\Omega \left\| \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} \right) \left\| \delta \sigma \right\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)},
\end{aligned}$$

where M_g is the maximum of g on $\partial\Omega$. Therefore there exists $\eta > 0$ such that if

$$C_\Omega \left\| \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)} < \eta$$

then

$$\left\| \sigma - \tilde{\sigma} \right\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C^* \left\| \sum_{i=1}^m \chi_i \Lambda(\sigma u_i - \tilde{\sigma} \tilde{u}_i) \right\|_{H^1([0,T]) \times \partial B_\rho}, \quad (25)$$

for some $C^* > 0$ independent of $\tilde{\sigma}$ and σ . $\square$

Acknowledgment

GB's work was supported in part by the NSF grant DMS-1408867. AM's work is supported by a start-up grant from University of California, Riverside. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for careful reading of the manuscript and helpful comments.

References

- [1] S. R. ARRIDGE AND J. C. SCHOTLAND, Optical tomography: forward and inverse problems, *Inverse Problems*, 25 (2010), p. 123010.
- [2] G. Bal, K. Ren, Multiple-source quantitative photoacoustic tomography, *Inverse Problems*, 27 (2011), 075003.
- [3] G. Bal, G. Uhlmann, Reconstruction of coefficients in scalar second-order elliptic equations from knowledge of their solutions, *Comm. on Pure and Applied Math.*, 66 (2013), 1692-1652.
- [4] H. P. BRECHT, R. SU, M. FRONHEISER, C. A. ERMILOV, S. A., AND A. A. ORAEVSKY, Whole-body three-dimensional optoacoustic tomography system for small animals, *J Biomed Opt.*, 14 (2009), p. 064007.
- [5] B. T. COX, S. R. ARRIDGE, AND P. C. BEARD, Estimating chromophore distributions from multiwavelength photoacoustic images, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. A*, 26 (2009), pp. 443–455.

- [6] B. T. COX, J. G. LAUFER, AND P. C. BEARD, The challenges for quantitative photoacoustic imaging, *Proc. of SPIE*, 7177 (2009), p. 717713.
- [7] ———, Quantitative photoacoustic image reconstruction using fluence dependent chromophores, *Biomedical Optics Express*, 1(1) (2010), pp. 201–208.
- [8] A. GRIGIS, J. SJSTRAND, *Microlocal analysis for differential operators: an introduction*, Cambridge U.P. 1994.
- [9] P. KUCHMENT AND L. KUNYANSKY, Mathematics of thermoacoustic tomography, *Euro. J. Appl. Math.*, 19 (2008), pp. 191–224.
- [10] I. Lasiecka, J.-L. Lions, and R. Triggiani, Nonhomogeneous boundary value problems for second order hyperbolic operators, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* (9), 65(2):149192, 1986.
- [11] O. Lauri, G. Uhlmann, Photoacoustic and Thermoacoustic Tomography with an Uncertain Wave Speed, Preprint.
- [12] J. Qian, P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, Hong-Kai Zhao, An Efficient Neumann-series Based Algorithm for the Thermoacoustic and Photoacoustic Tomography with Variable Sound Speed, *SIAM J. Imaging Sciences*, 4 (2011), 850-883.
- [13] S. PATCH AND O. SCHERZER, Photo- and thermo- acoustic imaging, *Inverse Problems*, 23 (2007), pp. S1–10.
- [14] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, Recovery of a Source or a Speed with One Measurement and Applications, *Transactions of AMS.*, 365 (2013), 5737-5758.
- [15] P. Stefanov, G. Uhlmann, Thermoacoustic Tomography with variable sound speed, *Inverse Problems*, 25 (2009), 075011.
- [16] F. Treves. *Introduction to pseudodifferential and Fourier integral operators*. Vol. 1. Plenum Press, New York, 1980. Pseudodifferential operators, The University Series in Mathematics.
- [17] F. Treves. *Introduction to pseudodifferential and Fourier integral operators*. Vol. 2. Plenum Press, New York, 1980. Fourier integral operators, The University Series in Mathematics.
- [18] M. E. Taylor. *Pseudodifferential operators*, volume 34 of Princeton Mathematical Series. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1981.
- [19] L. V. WANG, Ultrasound-mediated biophotonic imaging: a review of acousto-optical tomography and photo-acoustic tomography, *Journal of Disease Markers*, 19 (2004), pp. 123–138.
- [20] M. XU AND L. V. WANG, Photoacoustic imaging in biomedicine, *Rev. Sci. Instr.*, 77 (2006), p. 041101.
- [21] L. YANG, V. NADVORETSKIY, K. WANG, S. EMILOV, A. ORAEVSKY, AND M. ANASTASIO, Effect of rotating partial illumination on image reconstruction for optoacoustic breast tomography, in *Proc. SPIE 9323, Photons Plus Ultrasound: Imaging and Sensing*, 2015.
- [22] R. J. ZEMP, Quantitative photoacoustic tomography with multiple optical sources, *Applied Optics*, 49 (2010), pp. 3566–3572.